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Dear Maury:

In response to your letter of June 1, there are three main problems which present implementation difficulties with respect to the "Laboratory Store" bill:

1. **Lack of Space**

   a. The present Central Stores facility is overcrowded; cartons are stacked in the aisles to the extent that it is difficult to move around. There is presently no place in this facility for stocking delicate equipment for ready retrieval.

   b. A recent study of the University's present and future total need for a Central Stores operation recommended an expanded operation, which would embrace this specific Senate recommendation. The study cited a need for a facility of several times the space now available, and for centralizing all receiving, stocking and distribution in one area. It projected other benefits, such as removing all commercial trucks, other than Dining Services, from the interior campus and deliveries to departments in convenient lots and at appropriate times. To date we have been unable to find or create the space needed to put the recommendations into practice.

   c. The Senate recommendation might be implemented for the 20 or more departments using lab equipment and the several basic chemicals similar to the present stockrooms of the Colleges of Pharmacy and Chemistry. This would, however, necessitate the finding of suitable
space, and involve a duplication of personnel and transportation.

2. **Lack of Adequate Transportation**

Any substantial increase in delivery requirements, whether from Central Stores or separate facility, would require another suitable vehicle and driver. Other priorities have exhausted the classified positions received for 73-74.

3. **Lack of Personnel**

There are 7 persons working with our Central Stores, and 2 in Housing's operation. Duplication of effort and manpower waste exist now, due to our inadequate central facility and decentralized service. An expanded operation which would greatly improve the services provided, could be handled with the same, or perhaps fewer, people if the space can be created. To expand our capabilities as recommended by adding another location now would further decentralize the operation and at least one, and possibly two new persons would be needed.

The recommendation really has merit only as an accommodation. It should not be considered as a great money-saving plan, since the rather small price differentials from quantity purchasing undoubtedly would not balance the additional costs.

If we can acquire some surplus buildings from the Department of Defense as a result of closings scheduled for the next year, we will centralize all receiving and stores operations and thereby benefit now only those who carry on research but the entire community.

Cordially,

Werner A. Baum
President

cc: Vice President Joseph C. O'Connell
To: Professor Maurice Klein
   Chairman, Faculty Senate

From: Joseph C. O'Connell
      Vice President for Business Affairs

About the only comment I can give you on Senate Bill 72-73-39 (Laboratory Store) is that we are trying to secure space and personnel to expand and improve our Central Stores operation.

We hope to be able to obtain some surplus buildings from Navy installations and will assign a high priority to meeting the needs outlined by the Research Policy Committee. Mr. Davies, Business Manager, will keep the Space Committee informed of our progress.

cc: Mr. Davies
Professor Maurice Klein  
Faculty Senate  
E. Roosevelt Hall  
Campus  

Dear Maury:  

I am returning herewith, with approval "in principle"  
Faculty Senate bill 72-73-39, entitled "Final Report of the Research  
Policy Committee recommendation to Expand University Central  
Stores to Include a University Laboratory Store."  

My approval is qualified by the phrase "in principle"  
because there appear to be significant implementation difficulties  
even though the intent to the bill has significant merit.  

I am asking Vice President O'Connell to send you a  
separate communication, detailing the situation. I would not want  
it to be said that the Bill was approved but not implemented. It  
is therefore of some importance to me that the practical problems  
be clearly understood by the Senate.  

Cordially,  

Werner A. Baum  
President  

hgo  

cc: Vice President Ferrante  
Vice President O'Connell  

Enclosure
TO: President Werner A. Baum
FROM: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

1. The Attached BILL, titled **FINAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO EXPAND UNIVERSITY CENTRAL STORES TO INCLUDE A UNIVERSITY LABORATORY STORE**

   is forwarded for your consideration.

2. The original and two copies for your use are included.

3. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on **73-5-10**

4. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original or forward it to the Board of Regents, completing the appropriate endorsement below.

5. In accordance with Section 8, paragraph 2 of the Senate's By-Laws, this bill will become effective on **73-5-31** (date), three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; (3) you forward it to the Board of Regents for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Regents, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

   May 15, 1973
   (date)
   Stephen B. Wood /s/
   Chairman of the Faculty Senate

ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate
FROM: President of the University

1. Returned.

2. Approved **IN PRINCIPLE**

3. (if approved) In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Regents is not necessary.

   5/19/73
   (date)
   President

Form Revised 6/71
ALTERNATE ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Board of Regents.

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded.

2. Approved.

                      (date)                      President

ENDORSEMENT 2.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Chairman of the Board of Regents, via the University President.

1. Forwarded.

                      (date)                      /s/ (Office)

ENDORSEMENT 3.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded from the Chairman of the Board of Regents.

                      (date)                      President

Original received and forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and Registrar for filing in the Archives of the University.

                      (date)                      Chairman of the Faculty Senate
The following legislation is submitted for Senate consideration in the belief that enactment will enhance the climate for research on the URI campus.

**Item 1**

A. Intent: To increase the ceiling on utility purchase orders.

B. Justification: The present ceiling on utility purchase orders is $50.00. When an order exceeds this amount, it is processed via the state bid system. This procedure entails a delay of one or two months and often results in a change of vendor, substitution in items ordered, and frequent back-ordering which can further delay receipt six months or more. Current inflationary trends have reduced the purchasing power of $50.00 to such a low level that many expendable supplies cannot be purchased under the utility order ceiling.

C. Recommendation: The University President renew his initiatives to have the ceiling on utility purchase orders increased from $50.00 to $100.00.

**Item 2**

A. Intent: To establish a laboratory store on the campus of the University of Rhode Island.

B. Justification: It would be very useful for many departments in the University who carry on laboratory research and/or instruction to have a Central Storeroom that could supply a variety of items of common laboratory equipment. Presently such departments order these items in the smaller quantities they require which raises the price and entails delays in receipt of needed items. A Central Storeroom could maintain an inventory of items used by several departments and could purchase these in larger quantities in anticipation of needs. Suggested items that could fit into these categories are: common laboratory glassware (beakers, flasks, graduated cylinders, test tubes, tubing, etc.), rubber and plastic tubing, various types of bottles, metal clamps, spatulas, and thermometers. The departments would put together lists from which a generally useful inventory would be set up. It is not intended that such a storeroom be set up to take care of highly specialized needs, such as specific chemicals, electronic components, etc. - these should remain the responsibility of the specific departments as is true at the present time.
Summer Session

June 23, Monday
July 25, Friday
July 28, Monday
August 29, Friday

First Term Begins
First Term Ends
Second Term Begins
Second Term Ends

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest Calverley
Joan Clegg
Robert Netter
Robert Rainville
Edna Steeves
Edgar LeDuc, Chairman
C. Recommendation: The President authorize the Vice President for Business Affairs to expand the University Central Stores to include a University Laboratory Store. This store shall maintain an inventory of laboratory supplies commonly used in instruction and research as determined by a faculty committee drawn from departments utilizing the store.

Item 3

A. Intent: To improve the position of inventors relative to income derived from inventions patented while the inventor is employed by the University of Rhode Island.

B. Justification: The present policy stated in the University Manual unnecessarily restricts the portion of patent derived income which is paid to the faculty member whose invention has been patented. The disposition of income derived from a patent in excess of $25,000 is not specified in the University Manual.

C. Recommendation: Amend section 10.41.13 of the University Manual to read as follows (changes are underlined)

If the patent is obtained by the University, the inventor or assignor shall be paid the first $2,500 received as income from the patent after the University has been reimbursed for all expenses incident to securing and/or defending the patent, then 50% of the income above the original $2,500. If more than one inventor or discoverer is involved, the $2,500 and any additional income received shall be divided as agreed by the inventors or discoverers. If the investigator(s) bears the expense of obtaining the patent, the University shall receive no income from the patent.

Amend Section 10.41.14 as follows

Second and third sentences to read ... "If the University fails to agree to pay the costs of filing for letters patent within six months after the invention or discovery is announced to the University by written notification of the chairman of the Research Committee, or decides that it does not wish to assume full responsibility for a patent, then all rights and title to patent petition shall remain in the name of the inventor or discoverer. If the inventor or discoverer contracts with a collaborating agency for the purpose of securing a patent and developing it commercially and is responsible for all the negotiations involved, the inventor or discoverer, and not the University, shall receive all proceeds from license fees, royalties or other income resulting from the patent.

Amend Section 10.41.15 by placing a period after "thereafter in the last sentence and eliminate the last phrase, "up to a maximum of $25,000."
Item 4

A. Intent: To provide each department with a budget for graduate research based upon the number of graduate students enrolled in that department.

B. Justification: In these days of tightening budgets, it is too easy to cut back on graduate education to meet increasing demands of undergraduate courses. When this happens, U.R.I. fails to attract or loses quality students who can be better provided elsewhere. As a result, the entire university suffers. The loss of inspiration and leadership from these people is felt not only at the graduate level, but also as it would extend to the quality of undergraduate programs and faculty research.

C. Recommendation: Each department sponsoring a graduate degree shall be given a budget separate from that for undergraduate education. A specific sum of money shall be allotted to the department for each graduate student enrolled in a thesis program. The amount would be determined by the academic vice president according to the needs of research programs, varying considerably among departments. According to his discretion, the department chairman shall distribute these funds either directly to the student or to his faculty advisor to be used for materials or activities which would best benefit that student's research.

Item 5

A. Intent: To provide administrative flexibility in the employment of professional personnel on noncontinuing grant or contract funds.

B. Justification: Present classification of faculty positions is such that professional staff often cannot be employed on noncontinuing grant or contract funds at levels of compensation equivalent to that of regular faculty. All new faculty positions must be approved by the State Board of Regents where approval is normally restricted to teaching positions. Employing faculty on noncontinuing funds is risky because the University may become obligated to tenure positions when the funding supporting these positions is terminated. However, the stimulation and vitality to be gained by including non-teaching faculty on the staff of research programs when funding is available should not be compromised. This problem can be resolved by extending the rank of faculty equivalent to all professional appointments funded on noncontinuing fiscal resources. Such positions shall carry all rights and privileges afforded regular faculty including salary, fringe benefits, promotion but not tenure.

C. Recommendation: Amend section 4.12.12 of the University Manual to read as follows (changes are underlined)

4.12.12 Temporary and part-time appointments shall be classified according to their equivalent faculty rank for the determination of salaries and salary increases. This category includes lecturer, Adjunct professor, research associate, faculty equivalent, and others employed under limited programs of instruction or research.